

JULIE VILLA, Pro Se
933 Nottingham Road
Keller, TX 76248

Phone: 808-357-6764
Email: julievilla2002@gmail.com

Via ECF/EMAIL

Honorable Judge Gregory Woods
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
40 Foley Square, NY 10007

RE: Kumaran et al vs. Vision Financial Markets et al 1:20-CV-03871-GHW-SDA

Objection To Plaintiffs (ECF #142), and (ECF #143)

Dear Honorable Judges Woods,

On February 11, 2022, Friday, at 11:00 a.m. EST a telephonic conference was convened by Judge Woods to address Plaintiff's request for excess pages to an appeal (ECF #130). Plaintiffs' counsel Brian August, Plaintiff Pro Se Kumaran, and Defendant's counsel Jenny Chou and Defendant Pro Se Villa appeared on the call. A thorough review of the matters before Judge Woods related to these issues were addressed. The court gave more than sufficient time to hear all questions from the parties and made a point to ensure, by the parties' own verbal affirmative attestations, that no further clarification was required.

On February 12, 2022, Saturday, Plaintiffs filed (ECF #142), a 3-page letter requesting clarification on ORDER (ECF #140), while simultaneously endeavoring to move their filing of (ECF #143) an "Amended Appeal To District Juge Of Decision At (ECF #129)" through the court without consent or approval from the court. Plaintiff states in part "As a courtesy to the Court's new order, I have also edited the filing" (ECF #142, P.2).

No request was made by the court to edit the original appeal (ECF #130), and it serves no purpose now other than to confuse Defendant's as to which appeal requires a response. The amended appeal is 26 pages, still one page over the limit, and only 4 pages less than the original appeal. The original appeal (ECF #130) is the only recognized appeal by the court and stands as written. Defendant has already spent considerable time drafting a response to this appeal (ECF #130), and would be prejudiced if required to read and respond to the amended appeal (ECF #143).

Defendant objects to this violation of the plainly stated ORDER (ECF #140) denying Plaintiff's motion for leave to file excess pages. The ORDER states "**Plaintiffs have already filed** a thirty-page brief in connection with their motion".

Request For (ECF #142 and ECF #143) Be Deemed Moot

Defendant requests Plaintiff's (ECF #142), and (ECF #143) be deemed moot by the court.

February 13, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Villa

/s/Julie Villa

Pro-Se Defendant